



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/733,953

12/10/2003

Ravi Kumar Arimilli

AUS920020194US1

8162

42640

7590

07/20/2009

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY

SUITE 2110

AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

RUIZ, ARACELIS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2189

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/733,953	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ARIMILLI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ARACELIS RUIZ	<b>Art Unit</b> 2189	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 May 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2189

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-6, 8-24 are still present for examination.

Claim 7 has been cancelled.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 1, 2009 has been entered.

### ***Title***

The substitute title filed May 1, 2009 has been entered.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings were received on May 1, 2009. These drawings are acceptable.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 8-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gharachorloo et al. (US Patent No. 6,697,919) in view of Lai et al. (US Publication no. 2003/0120881) and in further view of Revilla et al. (US Patent No. 5,926, 831).

With respect to **claim 1**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches a data processing system (See FIG. 1), comprising: a system memory (see Fig. 1, memory subsystem 123); a plurality of processing cores (see column 4, lines 57-58, "...has eight processor cores"); a plurality of cache memories (see Fig. 1, caches 108, 110 and 114), wherein the plurality of cache memories temporarily hold cache lines of data identified by addresses of storage locations in the system memory and certain service memory access request receive via the interconnect that target those addresses (see column 9, lines 11-15; and column 18, lines 16-34); and a memory controller, (see column 4, line 49, "...memory controller". See FIG. 1) coupled to said interconnect and to the system memory (see column 4, lines 63-column 51 line 23. See also FIG. 1, element 118 connected to memory 123 and element 112 through element 114), that controls access to the system memory (see column 5, lines 4-7, "Memory controller (MC) 118 that preferably interfaces directly to a memory bank of DRAM (dynamic random access memory) chips...in a memory subsystem 123"), wherein said memory controller responsive to receipt of a memory access request broadcast the memory controller and the plurality of cache memories (see FIG. 1, element 102; and column 18, lines 16-34).

With respect to **claim 2**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches wherein said memory controller and said one or more processing cores are integrated within a same integrated circuit chip (see column 2, lines 10-14, "...the Alpha 21364 aggressively exploits semiconductor technology

Art Unit: 2189

trends by including a scaled 1 GHz 21264 core, two levels of caches, memory controller, coherence hardware, and network router all on a single die..." See FIG. 1).

With respect to **claims 3, 10 and 15**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches wherein said memory speculation mechanism comprises a memory speculation table ("directory", See rejection of claim 1 and FIGs. 4 and 10c) that stores a respective memory access history ("Directory Entry" of FIG. 4) for each of a plurality of threads executing within said one or more processing cores["simultaneous multithreading (SMT)" is disclosed in column 2, line 29. Also in column 1, lines 33-34, "instruction-level parallelism and speculative out-of-order execution" which teach this limitation).

With respect to **claims 4, 11 and 16**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches wherein said system memory (see FIG. 1, element 123) includes a plurality of storage locations (see abstract; "memory line") arranged in a plurality of banks (see column 5, lines 1-8; "each memory bank"), and wherein said memory speculation mechanism (see abstract; "directory") stores said historical information on a per-bank basis (see column 11, lines 56-61: "...the memory line address identifies the node 102, 104 that interfaces with the memory subsystem 123 that stores the memory line of information 184 (i.e., home node) and a specific position within the memory subsystem 123 of the memory line information." Also see FIG. 4, elements 180, 182, 184, 123).

Art Unit: 2189

With respect to **claims 5, 12 and 17**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches wherein said coherency message comprises a combined response representing a systemwide response to said memory access request (see column 23, lines 14-60).

With respect to **claim 6**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches wherein said system memory comprises a first system memory (see column 4, lines 63-67 - column 5, lines 1-8, "memory bank"); said memory controller comprises a first memory controller (see column 4, lines 63-67 - column 5, lines 1-8, "memory controller"); said data processing system further comprising a second system memory and a second memory controller that controls access to the second system memory (see column 4, lines 63-67 - column 5, lines 1-8, that each (1st, 2nd, etc...) processor core has its own memory (L1 cache, L2 cache, memory bank of DRAM) as well as memory controller. See FIGs. 1 and 2); said memory controller speculatively initiates access to said first system memory based upon historical information recorded by said second memory controller (see column 21, lines 59-63, "The present invention includes a cache coherence protocol (CCP) that enables the sharing of memory lines of information 184 across multiple nodes 102, 104." Gharachorloo teaches that memory speculation can be accessed by another node (processor core, memory controller, etc.: element 102 of FIG. 1) through CCP. Also see limitation in rejection of claim 1 (also interpreted under 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph) With respect to the limitation, "based upon historical information recorded by said second memory controller", the examiner notes that a second memory controller can be any of a plurality of memory controllers and therefore is interpreted as analogous to claim 1).

Art Unit: 2189

With respect to **claim 8**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches response logic that provides said coherency message for said memory access request (see column 23, lines 14-60).

With respect to **claims 9 and 14**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches a memory controller (see column 4, line 49; memory controller) for controlling access to a system memory (see FIG. 1, element 123; memory subsystem) of a data processing system (see FIG. 1), control logic, responsive to a memory access request, that responsive to receipt of a memory access request broadcast the memory controller and the plurality of cache memories (see FIG. 1, element 102; and column 18, lines 16-34).

With respect to **claims 13 and 18**, Gharachorloo et al. teaches wherein said control logic speculatively initiates access to said system memory based upon historical information recorded by another memory controller of another system memory (see column 21, lines 59-63, "The present invention includes a cache coherence protocol (CCP) that enables the sharing of memory lines of information 184 across multiple nodes 102, 104." Gharachorloo teaches that memory speculation can be accessed by another node (processor core, memory controller, etc.: element 102 of FIG. 1) through CCP).

Gharachorloo et al. does not teach said memory controller having a memory speculation mechanism that stores historical information regarding whether prior memory accesses were serviced by accessing the system memory as recited in claim 1; a memory speculation mechanism that indicates whether or not to perform speculative access to the memory based

Art Unit: 2189

upon historical information regarding whether prior memory accesses were serviced by accessing said system memory as recited in claim 9; and said memory controller storing in a memory speculation mechanism historical information regarding whether or not prior memory accesses were serviced by access to the system memory as recited in claim 14; if speculative access is indicated by the memory speculation mechanism, speculatively initiates access to the system memory to service the memory access request in advance of receipt by the memory controller of a coherency message indicating whether or not said memory access request is to be serviced by the memory controller accessing reference to said system memory; and if speculative access is not indicated by the memory speculation mechanism, initiates non-speculative access to the system memory to service the memory access request only in response to the coherency message indicating that the memory access request is to be serviced by the memory controller accessing the system memory as recited in claims 1, 9 and 14; wherein the memory controller, responsive to the coherency message, updates the memory speculation mechanism in response to confirmation of correctness of speculative access to the system memory as indicated by the coherency message as recited in claims 19, 21, and 23; and wherein the memory controller, responsive to the coherency message indicating speculative access to the system memory by the memory controller was incorrect, discards data associated with the memory access request as recited in claims 20, 22 and 24.

Lai et al. teaches a table that track the history of previous operations to a memory unit (see page 2, paragraph 29, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have



Art Unit: 2189

modified the method taught by Gharachorloo et al. to include the above mentioned because it can help to increase the rate of page hit to a memory unit (see page 2, paragraph 29, lines 5-11).

Gharachorloo et al. and Lai et al. do not teach if speculative access is indicated by the memory speculation mechanism, speculatively initiates access to the system memory to service the memory access request in advance of receipt by the memory controller of a coherency message indicating whether or not said memory access request is to be serviced by the memory controller accessing reference to said system memory; and if speculative access is not indicated by the memory speculation mechanism, initiates non-speculative access to the system memory to service the memory access request only in response to the coherency message indicating that the memory access request is to be serviced by the memory controller accessing the system memory as recited in claims 1, 9 and 14; wherein the memory controller, responsive to the coherency message, updates the memory speculation mechanism in response to confirmation of correctness of speculative access to the system memory as indicated by the coherency message as recited in claims 19, 21, and 23; and wherein the memory controller, responsive to the coherency message indicating speculative access to the system memory by the memory controller was incorrect, discards data associated with the memory access request as recited in claims 20, 22 and 24.

With respect to claims **1, 9 and 14**, Revilla et al. teaches if speculative access is indicated by the memory speculation mechanism, speculatively initiates access to the system memory to service the memory access request in advance of receipt by the memory controller of a coherency message indicating whether or not said memory access request is to be serviced by the memory controller accessing reference to said system memory (see column 5, lines 35-37; and

Art Unit: 2189

column 6, lines 45-55); and if speculative access is not indicated by the memory speculation mechanism, initiates non-speculative access to the system memory to service the memory access request only in response to the coherency message indicating that the memory access request is to be serviced by the memory controller accessing the system memory (see column 5, lines 35-37; and column 6, lines 45-55).

With respect to claims **19, 21 and 23**, Revilla et al. teaches wherein the memory controller, responsive to the coherency message, updates the memory speculation mechanism in response to confirmation of correctness of speculative access to the system memory as indicated by the coherency message (see column 5, lines 35-60).

With respect to claims **20, 22 and 24**, Revilla et al. teaches wherein the memory controller, responsive to the coherency message indicating speculative access to the system memory by the memory controller was incorrect, discards data associated with the memory access request (see column 5, lines 35-60).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have modified the method taught by Gharachorloo et al. and Lai et al. to include the above mentioned to avoid losing information or corrupting data (see column 2, lines 15-20).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-13, filed May 1, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Revilla et al. (US Patent No. 5,926, 831).

Applicant's arguments, see page 9, filed May 1, 2009, with respect to the objection of the specification have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the specification has been withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ARACELIS RUIZ whose telephone number is (571)270-1038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Reginald G. Bragdon can be reached on (571) 272-4204. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2189

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aracelis Ruiz/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2189

/Reginald G. Bragdon/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2189